REMARKS:

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiners Arnold and Pak for the courtesies and suggestions during a personal interview on April 27 regarding the above case. The substance of the interview was as stated in Interview Summary by Examiner Arnold.

The present amendment is made at the suggestion of the Examiners with regard to being more specific as to how the xenon is used in the present invention. In that regard, there is now only one independent claim, namely claim 7. Claim 7 now refers to the amount of xenon that would be used as an adjuvant to assist a medicament. Claim 7 also refers to the types of conditions for which the medicament (assisted by the xenon adjuvant) would be effective and claim 7 defines the xenon adjuvant and the medicament being administered to a patient having such condition. One of the steps recited in claim 7 is the selection of the patient as being some one having such condition.

Accordingly, it is not simply that the invention recognizes a heretofore unappreciated new use for xenon, but in addition, as defined in claim 7, the conditions for which the use would be applicable are specified. Further, because claim 7 defines the medicament and the xenon adjuvant being administered to a patient actually having that condition then, unlike the prior art, the present invention encompasses a recognition as to which patient actually has that condition and therefore has the medicament and the xenon adjuvant administered to treat that condition. This differs from any prior art practice where xenon is intended for some other purpose and where inherently the patient might incidentally also be treated for a condition of the type to

which the present invention is directed. In that regard, because the prior art practices are not intended to use xenon for the claimed purposes of claim 7, the prior art practices do not include as a step the selecting as a patient some one having the specified condition and then administering the appropriate medicament along with the xenon adjuvant to that patient to treat the condition.

In view of the above amendments and remarks this application should be passed to issue.

Dated: May 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Harold Pezzner

Harold Pezzner
Registration No.: 22,112
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street
P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, 19899
(302) 658-9141
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

462742